2nd August 1932]

(b) whether it is a fact that they were kept in custody from 11 a.m. on the 25th to 6-30 p.m. on the 26th February without being provided with food even once during the whole period and that they were not even allowed to get their food themselves; and

(c) whether it is a fact that they were threatened and beaten and compelled to state who published the notices and where they were published?

A.—(a) The persons in question were found distributing unauthorized news-sheets containing Congress literature. They were arrested and taken to the Police station with a view to prevent the continuance of the offence. They were not put into the lock-up.

(b) They were in the station premises from about 10-30 a.m. to 7-20 p.m. on the 25th. They were not in the lock-up and so were at liberty to procure their own food but apparently preferred not to do so.

(c) They were questioned as to the source of the unauthorized news-sheets but were not threatened or beaten.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXIII.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 10592-2, dated the 30th May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1120 in the Council on the 24th March 1932, the following information is placed on the Table of the House:—

* 1120 Q.—Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether a picketer Ayyasami who was not a member of an unlawful assembly was severely beaten by the Police in the City of Madura early in January and after he was disabled and prostrated the Police Sub-Inspector beat him further when he was lying on the ground unable to move and also kicked him with his boot-heel on his chest and ribs;

[2nd August 1932

(*b*) whether this instance was taken to the notice of the District Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police soon after it occurred and whether they were satisfied that it was a case of unwarranted use of force and of excessive force; and

(*c*) whether any disciplinary action has been taken against or punishment awarded to the Sub-Inspector concerned; if not, why not?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The Government understand that the hon. Member made the allegation informally to the District Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police. The picketer Ayyaswami may have been beaten in the course of the dispersal of one of the unlawful assemblies of picketers which had to be dispersed forcibly in Madura early in January, but no complaint was made by him of the use of excessive force. In the absence of any attempt to substantiate the allegations, the District Magistrate took no further proceedings.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.

APPENDIX XXIV.

[Vide item X—Papers laid on the Table of the House—page 101 supra.]

PUBLIC (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT.

U.O. Note No. 8835-2, dated the 31st May 1932.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 1074 in the Legislative Council on the 21st March 1932, the following further information is placed on the table of the House:—

Mikilineni Ramakotayya was concerned in the harbouring of volunteers from the Komaravolu Sibiram. He was sent for on 16th January 1932, whereupon a large crowd came towards the Police in a threatening attitude. They were therefore declared an unlawful assembly and were ordered to disperse. As they refused to do so, they were dispersed by force; Ramakotayya was in the crowd and received some lathi blows during the dispersal. He was not beaten for hoisting a national flag or for showing hospitality to congress people.

G. T. H. BRACKEN,
Chief Secretary.